

A family of diophantine equations of the form $x^4 + 2nx^2y^2 + my^4 = z^2$ with no solutions in $(\mathbb{Z}^+)^3$

Konstantine Zelator

Department of Mathematics

College of Arts and Sciences

Mail Stop 942

The University of Toledo

Toledo, OH 43606-3390

e-mails: konstantine-zelator@yahoo.com

konstantine.zelator@utoledo.edu

May 20, 2009

1 Introduction

In this work we present a family of diophantine equations of the form

$$x^4 + 2nx^2y^2 + my^4 = z^2 \tag{1}$$

with no nontrivial solutions.

This is done in Section 3, where the theorem in this paper, Theorem 1, and its proof are presented. The approach is elementary and uses only congruence arguments as well as decent. It is branched proof, with some of the branches leading to contradictions via congruence arguments. Two of the proof's branches lead to contradictions via a decent argument. Also in the proof, we make use of the well-known parametric formulas that describe all the solutions in $(\mathbb{Z}^+)^3$ to the diophantine equation $x^2 + \ell \cdot y^2 = z^2$, ℓ a positive integer. These formulas are found in Section 2. In Section 4, we

present a sampling of numerical examples. That is, a listing of combinations of integers n and m in (1), which satisfy the hypothesis of the theorem.

The paper concludes with Section 5, wherein we offer a brief historical commentary on diophantine equations of the form $ax^4 + bx^2y^2 + cy^4 = dz^2$. Investigations of these types of diophantine equations span a time interval of nearly 400 years, not to go back any further in time. We mention some of the results found in the literature, including more recent developments (of the last 70 years) on the subject involving the usage of local methods as well as the association of such equations with elliptic curves.

2 An auxiliary diophantine equation:

$$x^2 + \ell \cdot y^2 = z^2$$

For a given positive integer ℓ , the solution set (subset of $(\mathbb{Z}^+)^3$) of the diophantine equation $x^2 + \ell y^2 = z^2$, can be parametrically described by the formulas,

$$x = \frac{d(\rho_1 k^2 - \rho_2 \lambda^2)}{2}, \quad y = dk\lambda, \quad z = \frac{d(\rho_1 k^2 + \rho_2 \lambda^2)}{2}$$

where the parameters d, k, λ are positive integers such that $(k, \lambda) = 1$; and the positive integers ρ_1, ρ_2 are divisors of ℓ such that $\rho_1 \rho_2 = \ell$. Obviously, if we require that $(x, y) = 1$, then all the solutions in $(\mathbb{Z}^+)^3$ can be parametrically described as follows:

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} x = \frac{d(\rho_1 k^2 - \rho_2 \lambda^2)}{2}, \quad y = dk\lambda, \quad z = \frac{d(\rho_1 k^2 + \rho_2 \lambda^2)}{2}, \\ \text{with } d, k, \lambda, \rho_1, \rho_2 \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \text{ such that } (k, \lambda) = 1, \quad \rho_1 \rho_2 = \ell \\ \text{and with } d = 1 \text{ or } 2. \text{ Also, } \rho_1 k^2 - \rho_2 \lambda^2 > 0. \end{array} \right\} \quad (2)$$

These parametric formulas are well known in the literature and can be found in reference [1], (pages 420-421). A derivation of them can also be found in [2].

3 The theorem and its proof

Theorem 1: Suppose that n is a positive integer, p an odd prime, and such that either

$$n \equiv 0 \pmod{4} \quad \text{and} \quad p \equiv 3 \pmod{8}; \quad \text{or alternatively,}$$

$$n \equiv 2 \pmod{4} \quad \text{and} \quad p \equiv 7 \pmod{8}$$

In addition to the above, assume that one of the following hypotheses holds: either

- (i) $n^2 - p > 0$ and the positive integer $m = n^2 - p$ is a prime, or
- (ii) $n^2 - p < 0$ and the positive integer $N = -m = -(n^2 - p)$ is a prime.

Then, the diophantine equation $x^4 + 2nx^2y^2 + my^4 = z^2$ has no solution in $(\mathbb{Z}^+)^3$.

Proof: If equation (1) has a solution, then let (X_0, Y_0, Z_0) be a solution with the product X_0Y_0 being least. Let $\delta = (X_0, Y_0)$, so that $X_0 = \delta x_0$, $Y_0 = \delta y_0$, for positive integers x_0, y_0, δ such that $(x_0, y_0) = 1$. Then, (1) implies $\delta^4 \mid Z_0^2$ and so $\delta^2 \mid Z_0$; and by putting $Z_0 = \delta z_0$ for some $z_0 \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ we obtain

$$x_0^4 + 2nx_0^2y_0^2 + my_0^4 = z_0^2 \tag{3}$$

By (3), the triple (x_0, y_0, z_0) is a solution to equation (1). Thus, by the minimality of the product X_0Y_0 it follows that $\delta = 1$, $X_0 = x_0$, $Y_0 = y_0$, $Z_0 = z_0$.

Since x_0 and y_0 are relatively prime, there are three possibilities:

$$x_0 \equiv y_0 \equiv 1 \pmod{2}; \quad x_0 \equiv 0 \text{ and } y_0 \equiv 1 \pmod{2}; \quad \text{or } x_0 \equiv 1 \text{ and } y_0 \equiv 0 \pmod{2}.$$

If x_0 and y_0 are both odd, consider equation (3) modulo 4. Since $x_0^2 \equiv y_0^2 \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$, in this case, (3) implies $1 + 2n + m \equiv z_0^2 \pmod{4}$. By the Theorem's hypothesis, $2n \equiv 0 \pmod{4}$ and $m = n^2 - p$; we obtain $1 - p \equiv z_0^2 \pmod{4}$, which gives $z_0^2 \equiv 2 \pmod{4}$ in view of $p \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$, an impossibility.

Next consider the second possibility. The combination x_0 being even and y_0 odd. By (3), since m is odd, we see that z_0 must be odd as well. Consider

(3) modulo 8. In view of $y_0^2 \equiv z_0^2 \equiv 1 \pmod{8}$, (3) implies $m \equiv 1 \pmod{8}$, a contradiction since by hypothesis:

$$m = n^2 - p \equiv 0 - 3 \equiv 5 \pmod{8}, \text{ if } n \equiv 0 \pmod{4} \text{ and } p \equiv 3 \pmod{8},$$

while also,

$$m = n^2 - p \equiv 4 - 7 \equiv 5 \pmod{8}, \text{ if } n \equiv 2 \pmod{4} \text{ and } p \equiv 7 \pmod{8}.$$

We conclude that x_0 must be odd and y_0 even. Also, it is clear from (3) that since $(x_0, y_0) = 1$, y_0 and z_0 must be relatively prime as well; and z_0 must be odd. Therefore,

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} x_0^4 + 2nx_0^2y_0^2 + my_0^4 = z_0^2 \\ x_0 \equiv z_0 \equiv 1 \pmod{2}, y_0 \equiv 0 \pmod{2} \\ (x_0, y_0) = 1 = (y_0, z_0) \end{array} \right\} \quad (4)$$

Now we use the hypothesis that $m = n^2 - p$. An algebraic manipulation of the equation in (4) leads to,

$$\begin{aligned} (x_0^2 + ny_0^2)^2 - z_0^2 &= py_0^4; \\ [(x_0^2 + ny_0^2) + z_0] [(x_0^2 + ny_0^2) - z_0] &= py_0^4 \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

According to the conditions in (4) both $(x_0^2 + ny_0^2)$ and z_0 are odd integers, but they are also coprime. Indeed, if a prime $q \neq p$ were a common divisor of theirs, then by (5) it would also divide y_0 and therefore, x_0 as well, violating $(x_0, y_0) = 1$. If p divided both $(x_0^2 + ny_0^2)$ and z_0 , then p^2 would divide the left-hand side of (5), and thus p would divide y_0 . Hence, it would divide x_0 , contrary once more to $(x_0, y_0) = 1$. We conclude that

$$(x_0^2 + ny_0^2, z_0) = 1 \quad (6)$$

Moreover, the sum of any two odd integers is congruent to 0 (mod 4) and their difference to 2 (mod 4); or vice-versa. Combining this observation with (6) leads to,

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} x_0^2 + ny_0^2 + z_0 = 2\delta_1 \\ x_0^2 + ny_0^2 - z_0 = 2\delta_2 \\ \text{for } \delta_1, \delta_2 \in \mathbb{Z}^+, \text{ with } (\delta_1, \delta_2) = 1 \text{ and } \delta_1 + \delta_2 \equiv 1 \pmod{2} \end{array} \right\}. \quad (7)$$

Adding the two equations in (7) yields,

$$x_0^2 + ny_0^2 = \delta_1 + \delta_2. \quad (8)$$

According to (7), δ_1 must be even and δ_2 odd; or vice-versa. Given that the rest of the proof rests on (8) and that (8) is symmetric in δ_1 and δ_2 . There is no need to distinguish between two cases, they lead to the same contradictions. Accordingly, assume that δ_1 is even and δ_2 is odd.

If we combine (7) with (5), we see that since p is an odd prime, there are precisely two possibilities expressed in (9) below:

Either $2\delta_1 = 8py_1^4$ and $2\delta_2 = 2y_2^4$ (9a)	(9)
or $2\delta_1 = 8y_1^4$ and $2\delta_2 = 2py_2^4$ (9b)	
for positive integers y_1, y_2 , such that $(y_1, y_2) = 1$	
and $y_2 \equiv 1 \pmod{2}$.	
Note that in either case, we have from (5), $2y_1y_2 = y_0$.	

Case 1: Assume possibility (9b) in (9) to hold. Then by combining (9b) with (8) gives

$$x_0^2 + ny_0^2 = 4y_1^4 + py_2^2,$$

which is impossible modulo 4, since by (4) we have $x_0^2 + ny_0^2 \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$, while $4y_1^4 + py_2^2 \equiv p \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$, in view of the hypothesis of the theorem.

Case 2: Assume possibility (9a) to be the case in (9).

Subcase 2(i): Assume hypothesis (i) in the theorem, which means that the integer $n^2 - p = m$ is positive and a prime. By combining (9a) with (8) and $2y_1y_2 = y_0$ in (9) we obtain

$$x_0^2 + (n^2 - p) \cdot (2y_1^2)^2 = (y_2^2 - 2ny_1^2)^2 \quad (10)$$

According to (10), the triple $(x_0, 2y_1^2, |y_2^2 - 2ny_1^2|)$ is a positive integer solution to the diophantine equation $x^2 + \ell y^2 = z^2$, with $\ell = n^2 - p$. Also note that $(x_0, 2y_1^2) = 1$, by virtue of the fact that $(x_0, y_0) = 1$ in (4) and $y_0 = 2y_1y_2$ in (9). Therefore, by (2), we must have

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} 2y_1^2 = dk\lambda, \quad |y_2^2 - 2ny_1^2| = \frac{d(\rho_1 k^2 + \rho_2 \lambda^2)}{2}, \text{ for positive} \\ \text{integers } d, k, \lambda, \rho_1, \rho_2; \text{ such that } (k, \lambda) = 1, \quad \rho_1 \rho_2 = n^2 - p \\ \text{and with } d = 1 \text{ or } 2 \end{array} \right\} \quad (10a)$$

The possibility $d = 1$ is easily ruled out by the fact that ρ_1 and ρ_2 are both odd (since $m = n^2 - p$ is odd); and the fact that $(k, \lambda) = 1$. Indeed, the first equation (10a) implies, if $d = 1$, that k and λ must have different parities. But, then the integer $\rho_1 k^2 + \rho_2 \lambda^2$ would be odd, instead of even as the second equation in (10a) requires. Thus, $d = 2$ which yields, by (10a)

$$\begin{aligned} y_1^2 &= k\lambda, \quad |y_2^2 - 2ny_1^2| = \rho_1 k^2 + \rho_2 \lambda^2; \text{ or equivalently} \\ \{y_1^2 &= k\lambda, \quad y_2^2 - 2ny_1^2 = \pm(\rho_1 k^2 + \rho_2 \lambda^2)\} \end{aligned} \quad (10b)$$

The first equation in (10b) implies, since $(k, \lambda) = 1$, that $k = k_1^2$ and $\lambda = \lambda_1^2$; for some $\lambda_1, k_1 \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, with $(k_1, \lambda_1) = 1$.

Accordingly (10b) gives,

$$y_2^2 - 2nk_1^2 \lambda_1^2 = \pm(\rho_1 k_1^4 + \rho_2 \lambda_1^4) \quad (10c)$$

since $y_1 = k_1 \lambda_1$.

If the plus sign holds in (10c), we obtain

$$y_2^2 = \rho_1 k_1^4 + 2nk_1^2 \lambda_1^2 + \rho_2 \lambda_1^4 \quad (10d)$$

By (10a) we know that $\rho_1 \rho_2 = m = n^2 - p$. But m is a prime and so either $\rho_1 = m$ and $\rho_2 = 1$ or vice-versa. In either case, (10d) shows that the triple (k_1, λ_1, y_2) is a positive integer solution to the diophantine equation (1). Compare this solution with the solution (x_0, y_0, z_0) (see (3)). We have

$$x_0 y_0 \geq y_0 = 2y_1 y_2 > y_1 = k_1 \lambda_1.$$

In short, by (9) $x_0 y_0 > k_1 \lambda_1$, contradicting the fact that $x_0 y_0$ is least.

If the minus sign holds in (10c),

$$y_2^2 = -\rho_1 k_1^4 + 2nk_1^2 \lambda_1^2 - \rho_2 \lambda_1^4 \quad (10e)$$

Again, we use the fact that either $\rho_1 = n^2 - p$ and $\rho_2 = 1$ or vice-versa.

In either case, $\rho_1 + \rho_2 = n^2 - p + 1$. Consider (10e) modulo 4. If both k_1 and λ_1 are odd, then $k_1^2 \equiv \lambda_1^2 \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$ and so (10e) implies,

$$y_2^2 \equiv -\rho_1 + 2n - \rho_2 \equiv -(\rho_1 + \rho_2) + 2n \equiv -(n^2 - p + 1) + 2n \pmod{4};$$

$$y_2^2 \equiv -n^2 + p - 1 + 2n \equiv 2 \pmod{4},$$

since by hypothesis $p \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$ and n is even. Thus, a contradiction.

If $k_1 + \lambda_1 \equiv 1 \pmod{2}$, again consider (10e) modulo 4. Given that $\rho_1 = n^2 - p$ and $\rho_2 = 1$ or vice-versa, and that k_1 is odd and λ_1 even, or vice-versa. The four combinations, because of the symmetry of (10e) reduce to two congruence possibilities: $y_2^2 \equiv -1$ or $y_2^2 \equiv -(n^2 - p) \pmod{4}$, but $n^2 - p \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$, by hypothesis. Therefore we see that in both cases we arrive at $y_2^2 \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$ which is impossible. This concludes the proof in subcase (2i).

Subcase 2(ii): Assume hypothesis (ii) of the theorem. Then $n^2 - p < 0$ and $N = p - n^2$ is a prime. Combining (8) with (9a) and $2y_1 y_2 = y_0$ in (9) leads to

$$x_0^2 = (y_2^2 - 2ny_1^2)^2 + (p - n^2)(2y_1^2)^2 \quad (11)$$

By (9) we know that $(y_1, y_2) = 1$ and y_2 is odd; which implies that $(y_2^2 - 2ny_1^2, 2y_1^2) = 1$. By (11), the triple $(|y_2^2 - 2ny_1^2|, 2y_1^2, x_0)$ is a positive integer solution to the diophantine equation $x^2 + \ell y^2 = z^2$, with $\ell = p - n^2$; and with the integers $|y_2^2 - 2ny_1^2|$ and $2y_1^2$ being relative prime. Accordingly, by (2) we must have

$$\begin{aligned} |y_2^2 - 2ny_1^2| &= \frac{d(\rho_1 k^2 - \rho_2 \lambda^2)}{2}, \quad 2y_1^2 = dk\lambda; \\ \left\{ \begin{array}{l} y_2^2 - 2ny_1^2 = \pm \frac{d(\rho_1 k^2 - \rho_2 \lambda^2)}{2}, \quad 2y_1^2 = dk\lambda, \\ \text{for positive integers } d, k, \lambda, \rho_1, \rho_2 \text{ such that} \\ (k, \lambda) = 1, \quad \rho_1 \rho_2 = p - n^2, \text{ and with } d = 1 \text{ or } 2 \end{array} \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

Since we consider (below) all the combinations ρ_1, ρ_2 such that $\rho_1 \rho_2 = p - n^2$, it follows that the plus or minus possibilities in the first equation of (12) are really the same. Thus, we may write

$$y_2^2 - 2ny_1^2 = \frac{d(\rho_1 k^2 - \rho_2 \lambda^2)}{2}, \quad 2y_1^2 = dk\lambda \quad (12a)$$

As we saw in the proof of subcase (ii), the possibility $d = 1$ is easily ruled out. Indeed, if $d = 1$, the first equation in (12a) implies that the integer $(\rho_1 k^2 - \rho_2 \lambda^2)$ must be even. On the other hand, the second equation in (12a) implies, since $(k, \lambda) = 1$ that k must be odd and λ even; or vice-versa. But then, by virtue of the fact that ρ_1, ρ_2 are both odd, it follows that $\rho_1 k^2 - \rho_2 \lambda^2 \equiv 1 \pmod{2}$, a contradiction. Thus, $d = 2$ in (12a). We have,

$$y_2^2 - 2ny_1^2 = \rho_1 k^2 - \rho_2 \lambda^2, \quad y_1^2 = k\lambda \quad (12b)$$

Obviously, the second equation in (12b) implies, since $(k, \lambda) = 1$, that $k = k_1^2$ and $\lambda_1^2 = \lambda$ for some $k_1, \lambda_1 \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, with $(k_1, \lambda_1) = 1$. Using $y_1 = k_1 \lambda_1$ as well, we see that (12b) implies

$$y_2^2 = \rho_1 k_1^4 + 2nk_1^2 \lambda_1^2 - \rho_2 \lambda_1^4 \quad (12c)$$

Since $\rho_1 \rho_2 = p - n^2 = \text{prime}$, there are precisely two possibilities. Either $\rho_1 = 1$, $\rho_2 = p - n^2$ or, alternatively, $\rho_1 = p - n^2$ and $\rho_2 = 1$. In the first case, $\rho_1 = 1$ and $-\rho_2 = n^2 - p = m$; so that by (12c), $y_2^2 = k_1^4 + 2nk_1^2 \lambda_1^2 + m\lambda_1^4$, which shows that the triple (k_1, λ_1, y_2) is a positive integer solution to the initial equation (1). Compare this solution with the solution (x_0, y_0, z_0) . We have, $x_0 y_0 \geq y_0 = 2y_1 y_2 > y_1 = k_1 \lambda_1$, violating the minimality of the product $x_0 y_0$. Next, assume the next possibility to take hold, namely $\rho_1 = p - n^2$ and $\rho_2 = 1$. Then equation (12c) implies,

$$y_2^2 = (p - n^2)k_1^4 + 2nk_1^2 \lambda_1^2 - \lambda_1^4 \quad (12d)$$

Consider (12d) modulo 4:

If $k_1 \equiv \lambda_1 \equiv 1 \pmod{2}$, then (12d) implies $y_2^2 \equiv p - n^2 + 2n - 1 \pmod{4} \Rightarrow$ (since n is even and $p \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$) $y_2^2 \equiv 2 \pmod{4}$, an impossibility.

If $k_1 \equiv 0$ and $\lambda_1 \equiv 1 \pmod{2}$, (12d) implies $y_2^2 \equiv -1 \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$, again impossible.

Finally, if k_1 is odd and λ_1 even, (12d) implies $y_2^2 \equiv p - n^2 \pmod{4}$; $y_2^2 \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$, again an impossibility.

This concludes the proof of subcase (ii) and with it, the proof of the theorem. ■

4 Numerical Examples

- (i) Below, we provide a list of all combinations of positive integers n, p, m ; such that both p and m are primes, $m = n^2 - p$, and with either $n \equiv 0 \pmod{4}$ and $p \equiv 3 \pmod{8}$, or alternatively, $n \equiv 2 \pmod{4}$ and $p \equiv 7 \pmod{8}$. Under the constraint $n \leq 16$, there are 24 such combinations.

	n	p	m
1)	4	3	13
2)	4	11	5
3)	6	7	29
4)	6	23	13
5)	6	31	5
6)	8	3	61
7)	8	11	53
8)	8	59	5
9)	10	47	53
10)	10	71	29
11)	12	43	101
12)	12	83	61

	n	p	m
13)	12	107	37
14)	12	131	13
15)	12	139	5
16)	14	23	173
17)	14	47	149
18)	14	167	29
19)	14	191	5
20)	16	59	197
21)	16	83	173
22)	16	107	149
23)	16	227	29
24)	16	251	5

- (ii) Below, we provide a listing of all combinations of integers n, p, m, N ; such that $n, p, N > 0$, $m < 0$, p and N are both primes, $N = p - n^2$, $m = -N$, and with either $n \equiv 0 \pmod{4}$ and $p \equiv 3 \pmod{8}$, or alternatively, with $n \equiv 2 \pmod{4}$ and $p \equiv 7 \pmod{8}$. Under the constraint $p \leq 251$, there are 29 such combinations.

	p	n	N	m
1)	7	2	3	-3
2)	23	2	19	-19
3)	47	2	43	-43
4)	47	6	11	-11
5)	59	4	43	-43
6)	67	8	3	-3
7)	71	2	67	-67
8)	79	2	73	-73
9)	79	6	43	-43
10)	83	4	67	-67
11)	83	8	19	-19
12)	103	6	67	-67
13)	103	10	3	-3
14)	107	8	43	-43
15)	131	8	67	-67

	p	n	N	m
16)	163	12	19	-19
17)	167	2	163	-163
18)	167	6	131	-131
19)	167	10	67	-67
20)	179	4	163	-163
21)	199	6	163	-163
22)	199	14	3	-3
23)	211	12	67	-67
24)	227	4	211	-211
25)	227	8	163	-163
26)	227	12	83	-83
27)	239	10	139	-139
28)	239	14	43	-43
29)	251	12	107	-107

5 Historical Commentary

Mathematical research on diophantine equations of the form

$$ax^4 + bx^2y^2 + cy^4 = dz^2 \quad (13)$$

dates back to the early 17th century. The most comprehensive source of results on such equations in the 300 year-period from the early 17th century to about 1920, is I. E. Dickson's monumental book *History of the Theory of Numbers, Vol. II*, (see [1]).

All or almost all results (at least the referenced ones) of that period can be found in that book. Various researchers during that time period employed decent methods to tackle such equations. Perhaps all the significant results achieved in that 300-year period can be attributed to about 40-50 investigators. We list the names of thirty-two of them:

Fermat, Frenicle, St. Martin, Genocchi, Lagrange, Legendre, Lebesgue, Euler, Adrain, Gerardin, Aubry, Fauquenbergue, Sucksdorff, Gleizes,

Mathieu, Moret-Blank, Rignaux, Kausler, Fuss, Auric, Realis, Mantel, Desboves, Kramer, Escott, Thue, Cunningham, Pepin, Lucas, Werebrusov, Carmichael, Pocklington.

A detailed account of the results obtained by these mathematicians is given in [1], pages 615-639.

On the other hand, the last 75 years or so (from the early 1930's to the present) are marked by the introduction and development of what is known as local methods as well as the connection/association of equations (13) with elliptic curves. In particular, the beginning of the 75 year period (early thirties) is characterized by a landmark, the Hasse Principle:

If $F \in \mathbb{Z}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ is a homogenous polynomial of degree 2, then $F(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ has a nontrivial solution in $\mathbb{Z}^n$ if, and only if,

- (a) it has a nontrivial solution in $\mathbb{R}^n$ and
- (b) it has a primitive solution modulo p^k , for all primes p and exponents $k \geq 1$.

Here, a solution $(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ is understood to be nontrivial if at least one of the a_i 's is not zero. It is primitive if one of the a_i 's is not divisible by p .

In 1951, E. Selmer (see [3]), presented an example of a homogenous polynomial in three variables, and degree $n = 3$ which fails the Hasse Principle. This is the equation $3x^3 + 4y^3 + 5z^3 = 0$, whose only solution in $\mathbb{Z}^3$ is $(0, 0, 0)$ (so it has no nontrivial solutions). But it obviously has nontrivial solutions in $\mathbb{R}^3$; and it has primitive solutions modulo each prime power.

In their paper W. Aitken and F. Lemmermeyer, (see [4]), show that equation (13) has a nontrivial solution in $\mathbb{Z}^3$ if, and only if, the diophantine system (in four variables u, v, w, z)

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{with } b^2 - 4ac \neq 0, \quad au^2 + bv^2 + cw^2 = dz^2 \\ \text{and } d \text{ squarefree,} \quad uw = v^2 \end{array} \right\} \quad (14)$$

has a nontrivial solution in $\mathbb{Z}^4$. This also holds when $\mathbb{Z}$ is replaced by any ring containing $\mathbb{Z}$. In particular, it holds for $\mathbb{R}$.

Furthermore, (14) has a primitive solution modulo p^k if, and only if, (13) has a primitive solution modulo p^k ; and $k \geq 2$. (If p is not a divisor of d , this can be extended to $k = 1$.)

In 1940 and 1942 respectively, C.-E Lind and H. Reichardt, (see [5] and [6]), found another counterexample to the Hasse Principle: the diophantine equation (13) with $a = 1$, $b = 0$, $c = -17$, and $d = 2$; that is the equation $x^4 - 17y^4 = 2z^2$.

Aitken and Lemmermeyer generalized the Lind and Reichardt example by taking $a = 1$, $b = 0$, $c = -q$, such that q is a prime with $q \equiv 1 \pmod{16}$, d is squarefree, d is a nonzero square but not a fourth power modulo q , and q is a fourth power modulo p for every odd prime p dividing d . Thus, they obtained a family of diophantine equations (13) (or equivalently, systems (14)) which fail the Hasse Principle. Their proofs of the nontrivial insolubility (of each member of that family) in $\mathbb{Z}^3$ only involves quadratic reciprocity arguments. The harder part is to give an elementary proof that the above equations have primitive solutions modulo all prime powers.

Variants of the Hasse Principle, and the manner in which these principles fail, can be found in a paper by B. Mazur (see [7]). Also, there is the seminal work by J. Silverman (see [8]), which provides a comprehensive study for the links between equations (13) and elliptic curves.

Alongside these developements of the last 75 years, there have been some results obtained by elementary means only. For example, A. Wakulitz (see [9]) has offered an elementary proof that the diophantine equation $x^4 + 9x^2y^2 + 27y^4 = z^2$ has no solution in $(\mathbb{Z}^+)^3$. A corollary of this (in the paper in [9]), is that the equation $x^3 + y^3 = 2z^3$ has no solution in $\mathbb{Z}^3$ with $x \neq y$ and $z \neq 0$.

References

- [1] Dickson, L. E., *History of the Theory of Numbers, Vol. II*, Chelsea Publishing, Providence, Rhode Island, (1992), 803 pp.
ISBN: 0-8218-1935-6

- [2] Zelator, K., *The diophantine equation $x^2 + ky^2 = z^2$ and integral triangles with a cosine value of $\frac{1}{n}$* , Mathematics and Computer Education, Fall 2006.
- [3] Selmer, E., *The diophantine equation $ax^3 + by^3 + cz^3 = 0$* , Acta Math. **85** (1951), 203-362.
- [4] Aitken, W., Lemmermeyer, F., *Counterexamples to Hasse Principle: An elementary introduction*,
http://public.csusm.edu/aitken_html/m372/diophantine.pdf.
- [5] Lind, C.-E., *Untersuchungen über die rationalen Punkte der ebenen kubischen kurven vom Geschlecht Eins*, Diss. Univ. Uppsala 1940.
- [6] Raichardt, H., *Einige im Kleinen überall lösbare, im Grossen unlösbare diophantische Gleichungen*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **184** (1942), 12-18.
- [7] Mazur, B., *On the passage from local to global in number theory*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.) **29** (1993), no. 1, 14-50.
- [8] Silverman, J., *The arithmetic of elliptic curves*, Springer-Verlag 1986.
- [9] Wakulitz, A., *On the equation $x^3 + y^3 = 2z^3$* , Colloq. Math., **5** (1957), 11-15.